



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,738	12/11/2003	David B. Allen	2003P14124US	8398

7590 11/16/2005  
Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

MCNEIL, JENNIFER C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1775

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,738

Applicant(s)

ALLEN, DAVID B.

Examiner

Jennifer C. McNeil

Art Unit

1775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09/06/05.  
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 4-18 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 4-18 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer et al (US 4,735,656).

Schaefer teaches an abrasive tip material for turbine blade tips. The abrasive material comprises MCrAlY matrix with ceramic particles dispersed therein. The ceramic particulate may be a mixture of ceramics such as BN, and SiN. Schaefer does not specifically teach the amounts of ceramic particles to be added. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use amounts of SiN and cBN that provide the desired abrasiveness to the coating, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233). SiN and cBN have known values of hardness; therefore one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious to vary the amounts to achieve the desired abrasive quality in the coating.

Claims 4, 5, 7-15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeffer et al (US 4,735,656) in view of Freling et al (US 6,190,124). Schaeffer teaches an abrasive

Art Unit: 1775

tip material as discussed above, but does not teach additional compositions of MCrAlY or specifics of the ring segment with which the tip comes into contact. Freling teaches a seal system including an abrasive tip and an abradable seal surface, and further teaches that typical abrasive tips comprise a plurality of cBN grits surrounded by an electroplated metal matrix. The metal matrix may be MCrAlY where M is a mixture of Ni and Co. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use alternative compositions of MCrAlY as taught by Freling in the article of Schaefer, as it is clearly demonstrated to be used successfully in combination with similar ceramic particles in a similar environment. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the abrasive tip of Schaeffer with an abradable seal surface like that taught by Freling, as it is clearly taught to be a common coating for abrasive tips used in conjunction with abradable coatings of YSZ.

Claims 4, 5, 7-15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeffer et al (US 4,735,656) in view of O'Hara et al (US 6,896,485). Schaeffer teaches an abrasive tip material as discussed above, but does not teach additional compositions of MCrAlY or specifics of the ring segment with which the tip comes into contact. O'Hara teaches a seal system including an abrasive tip and an abradable seal surface, wherein the abrasive tip comprises MCrAlY, formed mainly of Fe, Ni, Co, Cr, Al, and Y, and abrasives formed mainly of cBN, alumina, Sic, or diamonds. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use alternative compositions of MCrAlY as taught by O'Hara in the article of Schaefer, as it is clearly demonstrated to be used successfully in combination with similar ceramic particles in a similar environment. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the abrasive tip of Schaeffer with

Art Unit 1775

an abradable seal surface like that taught by O'Hara, as it is clearly taught to be a common coating for abrasive tips used in conjunction with abradable coatings of YSZ.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have overcome the rejections over Torigoe.

Applicant states that the rejection of claim 6 is not well founded. Claim 6 is considered a method limitation and does not provide structural distinction over the prior art.

Regarding Schaeffer, applicant argues that the abrasive coating of the instant claims has surprisingly proved to efficiently retain the benefits of each material system. Applicant states that including substantially greater amounts of cBN relative to SiN would cause degradation, and reversing this proportion would decrease the cutting ability. The instant specification states on page 6 that relative amounts of the abrasives can be varied to suit the specific engine application, which seems to imply that one of ordinary skill would be able to adjust the amounts of abrasives based on the desired function. Schaeffer clearly teaches that both SiN and BN may be used together in the abrasive tip. It is maintained that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to adjust the amounts of the two abrasives based upon their known hardness and durability to form an abrasive tip suitable for the specific engine application.

The new rejections with Freling and O'Hara are made above.


Art Unit 1775

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer C. McNeil whose telephone number is 571-272-1540. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on 571-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Jennifer C McNeil  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1775

JCM